	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/765,108	NISHIYAMA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Craig A. Renner	2627	

All Participants:

(1) *Craig A. Renner, Primary Examiner.*

(2) *Daniel J. Stanger, Attorney For Applicants.*

Status of Application: *Pending*

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: *30 June 2006*   **Time:** *N/A*

Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant   ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes   ☒ No
If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
Includes that in paragraph 9 of the Office action dated 10 February 2006

Claims discussed:
Includes 1, 4, 7, 10 and 16.

Prior art documents discussed:
Includes Larabell et al. (US 5,471,099).

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

_____   _____
(Examiner/SPE Signature)   (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

N/A

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: By examiner's amendment, the limitations of dependent claim 7 were incorporated into independent claim 1 in order to more clearly define over the prior art, supra, claim 7 was cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, minor clarifying adjustments were made to claims 4, 10 and 16, and the title was amended to be more clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.